

# WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

## COMMITTEE: BUDGET

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 2008

---

---

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS GERAGHTY  
BELDEN  
O'CONNOR  
CHAMPAGNE  
SHEEHAN  
MERLINO

### COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR KENNY

### OTHERS PRESENT:

FREDERICK MONROE, CHAIRMAN  
HAL PAYNE, COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL SERVICES  
JOANN MCKINSTRY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE &  
FISCAL SERVICES  
RICK MURPHY, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FISCAL SERVICES  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
SUPERVISORS BENTLEY  
GOODSPEED  
STEC  
TAYLOR  
THOMAS  
VANNESS  
WILLIAM LAMY, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
REPRESENTING THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE:  
BUD YORK, SHERIFF  
BOB SWAN, UNDERSHERIFF  
SHANE ROSS, CHIEF DEPUTY  
MIKE GATES, LIEUTENANT, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
TODD LUNT, HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR  
SHEILA WEAVER, COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL  
SERVICES  
PAT AUER, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH  
AMANDA ALLEN, LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

---

Mr. Geraghty called the meeting of the Budget Committee to order at 10:00 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Belden, seconded by Mr. O'Connor and carried unanimously to approve the minutes from the prior Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the following documents were distributed to the Committee members and are on file with the minutes:

1. Personnel Requests - 2009 Warren County Budget;
2. 2009 Budget - Appropriation Changes - Budget Officer Recommendation;
3. 2009 Budget - Revenue Changes;
4. 2009 Warren County Budget Analysis.

Mr. Geraghty directed the Committee to the Personnel Requests document and he asked Pat Auer, Director of Public Health, to outline the requests pertaining to her Department.

Mrs. Auer apprised that in the 2009 Public Health Budget proposal she had included requests for the addition of a Supervising Public Health Nurse position, base salary of \$56,150, reclassification of a Senior Account Clerk to that of a Principal Clerk, base salary of \$28,041, and an increase in the Part-time Help budget from \$500 to \$25,000. She noted that two positions had been eliminated within the Department's Table of Organization in order to assist in funding these personnel changes. The Supervising Public Health Nurse position, Mrs. Auer explained, was

necessary to assist Ginelle Jones, Assistant Director of Public Health, with her overwhelming workload which included receiving direct reports from the 32 nurses working within the Public Health Department. She said that although she attempted to assist Ms. Jones whenever possible, the need for assistance was reflected in the Early Intervention and Pre-School programs for which the lack of staffing was becoming counter-productive due to the volume and changing nature of the regulations associated with them. Ms. Auer stated that if the request for a Supervising Public Health Nurse position was not approved in the 2009 Budget Request, it would be presented again in 2010, as the position was necessary to the Department.

Referring to the Principal Clerk position, Mrs. Auer advised that the Early Intervention and Pre-School programs required personnel to inspect and determine if the services being paid for were actually being received. For instance, she explained, this person would be sure that the Bus Aides paid for by the County were actually present on bus runs and also to be sure that Bus Drivers were properly licensed and trained. Mrs. Auer pointed out that if some sort of adverse event occurred, no matter how small, the County would be required to provide documentation that inspections had been made to this extent. In addition, she said, this person would be expected to take calls from parents regarding the pick-up and drop-off of their children, as well as the costs associated with the bus transportation and any other concerns. Mrs. Auer noted that the person filling this position would be willing to listen and respond to parental questions with a sympathetic ear while maintaining the rules of the program. She added that a current Senior Account Clerk would be reclassified to increase the scope of the job responsibilities attached and would change the grade of the position from a Grade 4 to a Grade 7, which would incur a salary increase of \$1,210 annually.

Mrs. Auer stated that additional funding in the Part-time Help Code had been requested to assist with service coordination work. She said that if the work was not done in-house the services would have to be contracted to an outside source. Mrs. Auer stated that the funding would not be used unless it was necessary; however, she said, she did not know how much of the amount requested would actually be used during the year. As an alternative, Mrs. Auer suggested that the amount requested be reduced with the understanding that she would come to the Committee during the year to request funding as it was needed.

Mrs. Auer noted that although it was not included in the Personnel Request documentation distributed, she had also included a request to increase the salary of the WIC (Women, Infants and Children) Program Director's salary in her 2009 Budget request. Mr. Geraghty apprised that the increase was not included in the documentation because the request had been denied in the September 10<sup>th</sup> Budget Committee meeting. Mrs. Auer stated that while it was within the Committee's discretion to refuse the increase, she noted that the position's salary was 100% funded through the State; therefore, she added, this would be State WIC Program Grant funding lost by the County.

Mr. Belden asked if the Supervising Public Health Nurse position and the benefits attached would be completely funded through State reimbursement and Mrs. Auer replied in the negative. She explained that the position would be partially funded through the two positions previously eliminated from the Department's Table of Organization and would also receive 34% reimbursement from the State.

Mr. Geraghty announced that the total cost for all of the personnel changes requested by Mrs. Auer would be \$81,860 with \$13,909 being contributed by the County and the remainder being funded by the positions deleted and the 34% contributed through State funding.

Mr. Belden stated that although he agreed that the personnel requests might be necessary, the Department had survived without them for 2008 and they should try to do so again for 2009 due to the Budget issues faced. Mr. Champagne countered that while he too was aware of the need to reduce the 2009 Budget as much as possible, he

felt that the personnel changes requested by Mrs. Auer should be granted as one adverse event could lead to costs much higher than what would be paid to implement the additional staffing necessary to appropriately manage the Department. He added that he felt it was very difficult for Ms. Jones to solely manage the work of the 32 employees reporting to her and there was significant room for error due to the lack of managerial staffing.

Mr. O'Connor echoed Mr. Champagne's comments, adding that if they were to wait for a neutral budget situation to implement the personnel changes they would never be made, regardless of the detriment of the health and education of needy Warren County citizens. He stated that due to the two positions that had been eliminated in an effort to assist with the costs associated with the personnel changes, he had no issues with the request and would vote in favor of them. Mr. O'Connor said that he felt there were far too many employees reporting solely to Ms. Jones and that it would be a prudent decision on the part of the County to implement the changes requested.

Mr. Stec entered the meeting at 10:21 a.m.

Subsequent to further discussion on the matter, motion was made by Mr. Champagne, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried by majority vote to approve the three personnel requests as stated above, with Messrs. Belden and Merlino voting in opposition.

Mrs. Auer thanked the Committee and left the meeting at 10:32 a.m.

Mr. Merlino questioned the total amount of expenses incurred by the Department of Social Services (DSS) through the benefits awarded by the Temporary Assistance Programs. He said that he felt the amounts being awarded to individuals were overinflated and that sufficient efforts were not being made to ensure that the Temporary Assistance Programs were not being abused. As a specific example, Mr. Merlino cited that an individual hired to work for his personal business had left their position in order to return to collecting DSS benefits as they received more income in that manner for far less effort. He said that if there was some way to reduce the amount of assistance given, those funds could be returned to the General Fund to assist with the Budget situation, thereby reducing the burden to the County's taxpayers. Mr. Merlino stated that while he had no issue with lending assistance where it was needed, in some situations the level of benefits given did not seem appropriate.

Sheila Weaver, DSS Commissioner, apprised that approximately \$1,200 per month was given to each single person qualifying for the Temporary Assistance Program. She noted that this total was comprised of allowances for rent, utilities, food stamps, Medicare and HEAP (Home Energy Assistance Program) benefits. Ms. Weaver stated that there were measures in place to stop Program abuse and she asked Mr. Merlino to provide her with the name of the person he referred to so that the case could be researched to avoid any such abuse.

Mr. Merlino suggested that if the amount of assistance given could be reduced by 10%, although it would adversely affect those receiving assistance, it would greatly benefit the County taxpayers. Mr. VanNess agreed, adding that many County taxpayers worked and struggled to pay their own bills while being forced to unfairly contribute to those members of the Community who were able to work but chose not to in favor of collecting public assistance benefits.

Mr. O'Connor pointed out that while valid points were being made, the Temporary Assistance Program allowances were mandated by the State of New York and the County had no control over them. Mr. Goodspeed agreed adding that they could discuss the matter indefinitely but if the amounts were mandated by the State the County was forced to pay them.

Mr. VanNess pointed out that all of the public assistance programs offered by the County were not mandated and

could reasonably be discontinued. He suggested that Ms. Weaver be directed to provide a listing of the un-mandated programs offered by the DSS to be reviewed by the Committee for possible reduction. Mr. VanNess stated that although this might not be a fix for the 2009 Budget, it might be an avenue for saving County funds in the future.

Ms. Weaver advised that she would determine the total amount of public assistance given, as per Mr. Merlino's request, and would develop the listing of un-mandated programs requested by Mr. VanNess for presentation at a future Committee meeting.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Goodspeed requested that the program listing be provided in a chart form which would itemize each program including notations as to which were mandated and how they were funded in order to determine the amount raised by taxpayer dollars. He said that it was important to review all of this information before reducing programs that were assisting needy people; however, he added, it was also important to improve measures to reduce the abuse of these programs. Mr. Goodspeed noted that to a certain extent, legislative bodies were judged by how well they were able to assist those who cannot help themselves.

Moving on, Mr. Geraghty directed the Committee members to the document entitled "2009 Budget - Appropriation Changes - Budget Officer Recommendation". He noted that by revisiting the budget requests submitted by the larger Departments he had reduced the budget recommendation by an additional \$842,463. Mr. Geraghty added that this was as far as the budget could be reduced without cutting positions and programs.

Mr. Belden pointed out that Airport Overtime, Code A.5610 120, had been reduced by \$15,000 and he asked if this included funding for overtime costs anticipated for the 2009 Balloon Festival Event. Mr. Geraghty responded that efforts were being made by the Balloon Festival Committee to attain alternate staffing methods to facilitate the direction of parking in order to avoid the expenditure by the County. Mr. Belden said that if alternate arrangements were not made the County would be responsible for the overtime costs and would have to find a source of funding later in the year when it was needed. Mr. Geraghty countered that, as he had voiced during the Department Head meeting held earlier that morning, the Department Heads would be required to manage their budgets better in order to fund all necessary costs with the amounts allotted to them.

Referring to the Information Technology (IT) Salaries Budget, Code A.1680 110, which reflected a \$418,874 expenditure for salaries alone in 2009, Mr. Belden questioned the number of employees working in the IT Department. He noted that as per his recollection, when the IT Department was formed they had only intended for it to be a small Department employing no more than two to three people. Mr. Geraghty replied that he did not have such figures on hand but estimated that there were between seven and nine employees working in the IT Department. Mr. Belden stated that although he was happy with the services that the IT Department provided, he felt that \$418,874 was an extreme amount for salaries alone.

Mr. Champagne reminded Mr. Belden that the responsibilities of the IT Department had grown extensively since it was first formed; therefore, it was reasonable to assume that the associated staffing would increase also. He added that if there were issues with the caliber of the services provided, someone should look into the matter to be sure that the salaries attached to the positions were appropriate.

Mr. Geraghty apprised that Robert Metthe, IT Director, had been asked to prepare reports on several IT related

charges to the budget, one of those being the telephone usage costs in County Buildings. He said that it was their hope that in reviewing the matter a means to derive additional savings could be found. Mr. Geraghty then expressed his opinion that attainable goals should be set for all Departments to measure the abilities of the Department Heads in reaching them.

Mr. VanNess stated that he was a member of the Information Technology Committee and he noted that the Committee continuously set goals for the IT Department which seemed to have been met and were presented via PowerPoint presentation at each Committee meeting. He said that when the IT Department was formed, the County's computer systems were antiquated and it had taken some time to update the technology used to their current standards. Mr. VanNess noted that savings had been attained through the upgraded technology that were not readily visible within the budget but were valuable nonetheless. He advised that the salaries for the members of the IT staff were higher than in some other Departments but that was because the personnel had the knowledge and the ability to provide the services necessary and were paid commensurate with their experience.

Mr. Merlino pointed out that an additional \$130,000 had been cut from the Sheriff's Office Budget request while only \$60,000 had been cut from the DSS budget, which did not seem appropriate. Mr. Geraghty replied that during a prior Committee meeting a member of the Committee had expressed that an additional \$500,000 could be cut from the Sheriff's budget request. He said that he had done his best to reduce the budget further and had found only \$130,000 that could be removed. Mr. Geraghty noted that the increase in the Sheriff's Office Budget had nothing to do with expenditures, which had increased by only .0008% over the 2008 figures, but rather was solely due to a loss of \$600,000 in anticipated revenues. He advised that Sheriff York had prepared an analysis of the 2009 Sheriff's Office Budget request, which was available for any of the Committee members wishing to review it.

Sheriff York distributed copies of the Warren County Sheriff's Office 2009 Appropriations Analysis, a copy of which is on file with the minutes.

Referring to a reduction of \$25,000 in the Sheriff Law Enforcement Gas & Oil Budget, Code A.3110 442, Mr. VanNess stated that the amended total of \$350,000 was not sufficient to support the needs of the Department. He added that Sheriff York would be seeking additional funds prior to the end of 2009 when the appropriated amount had been expended. Mr. Geraghty responded that like all other Department Heads, Sheriff York would be asked to maintain his budget wisely in order to avoid overruns.

With respect to previous conversations regarding the possibility of housing Federal inmates in the County Jail, Mr. VanNess reported that he had discussed the matter with Mike Gates, Lieutenant, Department of Corrections, who had advised that the Jail was approaching capacity with County inmates and that there was no room to house Federal inmates. He added that the prediction made by Larry Cleveland, former Sheriff, had come true in that five years after the Public Safety Building was completed, the jail was approaching capacity with only County inmates. In addition, Mr. VanNess stated that the date of completion for the Essex County Jail had been drastically underestimated as when questioned on the matter it had been indicated that the facility would not be complete for two years, when in fact, it had been completed and was ready for occupation within six months of the inquiry. He said that once the jail was complete Warren County lost a great deal of revenue from housing the Essex County inmates, which could not be blamed on Sheriff York.

Chairman Monroe said that he had contacted Kevin Hayes, Washington County Administrator, regarding the boarding of Federal inmates, who had indicated that they'd had no adverse issues with the issue.

Sheriff York apprised that the County was legally permitted to board-in Federal inmates and he was currently preparing documentation on the associated costs which would be presented at the next Public Safety Committee meeting. He cautioned the Committee that in determining whether or not to house Federal inmates, they should consider not only the revenues that could be generated but also the issues that would come with the inmates, such as increased costs of Social Services benefits that might be sought by the families of the Federal inmates moving to the area. Sheriff York cited that while they might receive revenues of \$85 per day to house the inmate, they might be paying out \$200 per day in Social Services benefits. He added that he would present these factors, as well as accurate associated figures, to the Public Safety Committee. Sheriff York stated that he did not feel that it was cost effective to board-in Federal inmates due to these factors.

Mr. Gates stated that the ideal capacity of the County Jail was 186 inmates that would be broken down into four sub-categories by age and sex, then segregated into two additional categories based on the risk posed to the facility and community, whether that be maximum or medium security inmates. He said that all six of these classifications had to be kept separate within the facility; therefore, if there were two minor males of medium security and the smallest unit available housed five inmates, the remaining three cells could not be used for anything but like classifications. Sheriff York interjected that in situations such as this it might be less costly for the inmates to be boarded-out allowing for other inmates to be housed in the cells, rather than leaving them empty. Mr. Gates continued that because of these segregation classifications, the State had instituted an 85% rule which meant that when the jail reached 85% capacity it was considered at or approaching overcrowding status.

Chairman Monroe questioned if the 85% capacity could be exceeded and Mr. Gate replied that if the inmates housed were appropriate to the segregation rules the Jail could be filled to absolute capacity at 186 inmates. However, he added, due to the 85% rule and the unpredictability of incoming inmates, he was forced to plan for the worst case scenario which required that space be left available for new inmates.

Sheriff York apprised that the County was responsible for maintaining health and dental insurance for County inmates and the amount of money being spent in this manner was considerable. He explained that in an effort to reduce these costs, new procedures had been put in place mandating that he be notified immediately of any inmate seeking medical care to determine if the visit should take place at the County's expense. Sheriff York apprised, that approximately six months prior, the County had paid about \$30,000 for a bone marrow transplant required by an inmate who was being detained on a petit larceny charge which had required only \$500 bail. He said that in cases such as this, when the charge was minimal and the person did not appear to be a threat to society, he would contact the District Attorney to request that the Judge presiding over the charges be asked to waive bail and release the person on their own recognizance prior to gaining medical treatment in order to save County dollars.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Referring to the document entitled "2009 Warren County Budget Analysis", Mr. Stec pointed out that although Occupancy Tax funding was listed in the document, it could not be included in the tally because it was a different type of fund and was not to be included in the amount to be raised by taxes. He then noted that the total amount to be raised by taxes did not appear to have any contribution from the Surplus Fund. Mr. Stec asked what the total of the Surplus Fund was currently and how much had been contributed from the Surplus Fund to balance the 2007 Budget.

Mr. Geraghty advised that the Surplus Fund balance was currently \$4.4 million and while there was no contribution from the Fund balance for the 2007 Budget, \$2.5 million had been appropriated to balance the 2006 County Budget.

Chairman Monroe questioned if there was an estimate as to what the Surplus Fund balance would be at the close of 2008 and Hal Payne, Commissioner of Administrative & Fiscal Services, replied in the negative, noting that the total would decrease as additional monies would be necessary to cover decreases in the anticipated revenues received by the Offices of the Sheriff and the County Clerk.

Mr. Stec pointed out that the "Amount Needed to be Raised", as represented in the 2009 Warren County Budget Analysis document, appeared to include a \$3 million increase from the 2008 figure and Rick Murphy, Deputy Commissioner of Fiscal Services, confirmed this. Mr. Murphy also confirmed that the figures included all estimated revenues and expenditures for 2009 and he noted that no unexpected increases to this figure were anticipated. Mr. Stec questioned if any figures had been included for the anticipated sale of County-owned property and Mr. Geraghty replied in the negative. Mr. Stec stated that in light of the information presented, he was beginning to feel much more at ease with the Budget situation.

Chairman Monroe apprised that when the third quarter sales tax figures were received they would have a much better estimate of the Surplus Fund total subsequent to which they would be able to determine how much could safely be removed from the Fund balance to reduce the amount to be raised by taxes.

In light of the fact that the County was attempting to sell two parcels of land which they anticipated a sale price in excess of \$1 million for each, Mr. VanNess questioned if \$1 million could be taken from Fund Balance to reduce the tax burden with the understanding that the funds would immediately be returned to the Fund upon the sale of the County-owned property. Mr. Stec replied that this could be done and that the amount of Fund Balance used would be based on the County's confidence level in the anticipated sale price of the property.

Discussion ensued with respect to the matter.

Mr. Goodspeed reminded the Committee that in a previous meeting they had requested that a listing of pending retirements be developed and he asked if this had been done. Todd Lunt, Director of Human Resources, apprised that he had researched the number of employees age 55 and older and had found the following:

- Of the roughly 1,000 employees working for the County, approximately 200 of them were over 55;
- 25 of these 200 employees had 29 or more years of service with the County;
- 16 of these 200 employees had 24 to 28 years of service with the County;
- 23 of these 200 employees had 19 to 23 years of service with the County.

Mr. Lunt said that each Department could be canvassed to determine the number of employees anticipating retirement; however, he said, they were not able to confirm these retirements and reduce salaries in the 2009 Budget because if something happened and the employee decided not to retire they would have issues with a lack of funds to pay that persons salary.

Mr. Goodspeed suggested that they might consider reducing the salary budget by half the number of anticipated retirements; for example, if 15 retirements were anticipated they could budget for a reduction of seven positions, allowing amounts for any employees who might change their mind and decide to continue to work, rather than to retire. Mr. Geraghty stated that this had been considered but there was no way to include the appropriate salaries in the budget; therefore, they had not continued to research this idea. He added that once the positions were budgeted for, any retirements would lead to a reduction in salaries paid and would benefit the 2009 Budget during the year. Mr. Goodspeed then questioned if an incentive offer was available to encourage those employees eligible

for retirement to do so. Mr. Payne replied that he had spoken with Paul Dusek, County Attorney, regarding the matter and had found that most retirements occurred in February, after the employees received their vacation and holiday benefits. He added that Mr. Dusek had apprised that there was no legal way for the County to offer an incentive for employees to retire prior to receiving these benefits.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Stec advised that he had received figures regarding the amount to be raised by taxes which reflected the percentage increase to each Town if the amount was reduced from \$37.9 million to either \$37 million or \$36 million, representing either a \$1 or \$2 million decrease to the amount. He said that for the Town of Queensbury, the current total would require an 11% increase in the taxed amount, which he felt was unacceptable. Mr. Stec stated that a decrease by \$1 million would lower the percentage to 7.5% and a \$2 million decrease would lower the increase amount to less than 4%, which was ideal. He said that speaking for the Town of Queensbury, the desired target would be to reduce the amount to be raised by taxes by \$2 million, which would also reduce the tax rate increase for every Town to less than 10%, with most being under 5%. He said that Mr. Geraghty had done a good job in reducing the 2009 Budget so far, but he suggested that they find a way to reduce it further by \$2 million through a combination of additional budget cuts and use of Surplus Funds.

Mr. Champagne stated that if this was the direction chosen, a considerable amount would have to be contributed from the Surplus Fund because he did not feel that the 2009 Budget could be reduced by that amount without cutting programs or positions.

In response to Mr. VanNess' comment that there would not be any significant bonding costs incurred in 2010, Mr. Payne advised that this was incorrect and that \$14 million would be bonded in 2010 for the remaining costs of the Health and Human Services Building. Chairman Monroe added that he had recently received a letter from Supreme Court Judge David Krogmann expressing the continuing overcrowding issues faced by the County Courts. He said that the pressure to expand the area used by the Courts was mounting and the County would have to review this matter and make a determination as to how the issue should be addressed, possibly incurring additional costs to the County.

Referring to the "2009 Budget - Appropriation Changes - Budget Officer Recommendation" document, Mr. Goodspeed questioned what Department was represented by Agriculture & Livestock-Extension Services, Code A.8750 470, and Mr. Geraghty replied that this was for funding to the 4-H Program and to Cornell Cooperative Extension. Mr. Goodspeed noted that the total budgeted for this code was \$462,500 and he proposed that the amount be reduced by half and that two employees be removed from the IT Department in an effort to reduce the budget.

Mr. Thomas interjected that he opposed the reduction of funding suggested by Mr. Goodspeed as Cornell Cooperative Extension and the 4-H organization offered a number of educational programs to County residents which would cease when the funding was reduced. He stated that if there were more of these educational services available to County residents, the costs incurred through the Sheriff's Office and the DSS might be reduced as citizens would learn to better manage their money and become more productive citizens, thereby reducing the need for public assistance, as well as the amount of criminal activity. Mr. Goodspeed agreed that the services provided were beneficial to County residents; however, he pointed out, they were not essential.

Mr. Sheehan stated that before making any drastic cuts to the budget, they should review the results of the report



being prepared by Ms. Weaver with respect to un-mandated DSS programs. He added that they should request that Mrs. Auer prepare a similar report to determine if there were any un-mandated programs or services provided by the Public Health Department that might be reduced.

Mr. Stec said that he agreed with Mr. Sheehan's statements and he added that they also needed to consider health insurance costs and sales tax income, both of which had been estimated conservatively. He reminded the Committee that during the 2008 Budget process, an increase in health insurance costs had initially been estimated at 11%, while a much lower 3% increase had been realized. Mr. Stec stated that a decrease in the percentage estimated for the health insurance costs coupled with an increase in estimated sales tax income could have considerable positive affects on the budget.

Subsequent to further discussion, it was unanimously stated that none of the Supervisors in attendance would oppose the use of \$1 million from General Fund surplus to reduce the amount to be raised by taxes.

Motion was made by Mr. Belden, seconded by Mr. Champagne and carried unanimously to recommend that \$1 million from the General Fund surplus be applied to reduce the amount to be raised by taxes for the 2009 County Budget.

When the inquiry was made, Mr. Murphy apprised that health insurance costs for 2009 had been estimated at \$7.1 million; therefore, he said, a 1% decrease would incur a savings of \$71,000. Mr. Stec noted that the potential was present to save a considerable amount of money through a decrease in the estimated increase in health insurance costs.

Mr. Stec reiterated that the information to be presented at the next Budget Committee meeting should include the actual increase in health insurance costs; reports on un-mandated programs from both the DSS and Public Health Department and the actual third quarter sales tax figures, all of which could be used to more accurately determine the need for further reductions in the 2009 Budget.

Mr. Geraghty credited the Department Heads for doing a good job in reducing their budget requests and he noted that equipment purchases had been reduced by 2.9% through these efforts, which was commendable. He said that there was a lot of pressure on the Department Heads to maintain the budget given, rather than requesting additional funds at the end of the year. Mr. Geraghty stated that he felt the Department Heads were doing a great job and would continue to do so regardless of the budget constraints.

Discussion ensued.

As there was no further business to come before the Budget Committee, on motion made by Mr. Belden and seconded by Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Geraghty adjourned the meeting at 12:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Allen, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist